REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application, as amended, in view of the following remarks.

Applicants respectfully request consideration of all claims, as the withdrawn claims depend directly or indirectly on Claim 1 and merely further limit Claim 1. Thus, if Claim 1 is allowable no further search will be necessary (In re Ochai, 71 F3d 1565, 37 USPQ2d 1127 (Fed. Cir. 1995).

The present invention as set forth in **amended Claim 1** relates to a polycarbonate resin composition, comprising:

a resin mixture of (A) and (B):

(A) from 50 to 90 % by weight of a polycarbonate, and

(B) from 10 to 50 % by weight of a thermoplastic polyester, relative to 100 parts by weight of said resin mixture of (A) and (B);

(C) from 0.01 to 3 parts by weight of a polyfluoro-olefin resin, and

a mixture of (D) and (E);

wherein (D) is from 1 to 400 parts by weight of a polycarbonate-polyorganosiloxane copolymer;

wherein (E) is from 0.1 to 10 parts by weight of a functional silicone compound, and

wherein a silicone content derived from the component (D) and the component (E) falls between 0.5 and 10 % by weight of said resin composition.

None of Dieck et al (EP 105388), Nodera et al (EP 692522), or Liao et al (US 5,981,661) disclose or suggest a polycarbonate resin composition as claimed. In particular, none of the cited references have a combination of (D) and (E) as claimed.

Dieck et al (EP 105388) disclose thermoplastic resin compositions comprising (a) a poly (C2-6 alkylene terephthalate) resin and a minor proportion of (b) an aromatic polycarbonate resin, in combination with a rubbery vinyl addition polymer or a poly(co-carbonate-ester) resin (Dieck et al, page 5, first paragraph). Dieck et al disclose in table 7A, at page 24, the following components (a) to (d)

(a) 18 parts of RL1624 (copolymer of bisphenol A and tetrabromobisphenol A),

(b) 33.8 parts of Valox 295 [poly(1,4-butylene terephthalate)],

(c) Teflon 6 (cf. PTFE USP3, 856, 736), and

(d) Copel 3320[bisphenol A block-dimethyl siloxane block (dimethylsiloxane block 43%,)]. However, there is no disclosure or suggestion of a combination of a polycarbonate-polyorganosiloxane copolymer; and a functional silicone compound as claimed.

In addition, the polycarbonate, the (A) component in the present invention, does not contain halogen, and also that the ratio of the components of the present invention differs from that of Dieck et al.

Furthermore, Dieck et al relates to a polycarbonate which uses conventional halogen-containing flame retardants, and the drawbacks in such polycarbonate are clearly described in the present specification, on page 1, last line through page 2, line 9. Namely, the present invention has favorably and skillfully solved such drawbacks.

Nodera et al (EP 692522) disclose a polycarbonate resin composition which comprises a polycarbonate-polyorganosiloxane copolymer, a polycarbonate resin and a polytetrafluoroethylene which has fibril forming capability (Nodera et al, abstract). However, Nodera et al fail to disclose or suggest a thermoplastic polyester, and a mixture of a polycarbonate-polyorganosiloxane copolymer and a functional silicone compound as claimed.

Further, the Japanese Patent Application Laid Open No.81620/1996, corresponding to Nodera et al, is mentioned in the present specification, on page 4, line 18 through page 5, line 2, and its defects are clearly understood. That is, the present invention has overcome these defects.

Liao et al (US 5,981,661) disclose a flame retarded resin molding composition which comprises a polyester, and a polycarbonate blend modified with an organopolysiloxane-polycarbonate and a glycidyl ester impact modifier and a halogenated flame retardant. However, there is no disclosure or suggestion of the claimed combination of a polycarbonate-polyorganosiloxane copolymer and a functional silicone compound.

Thus, none of the secondary references cures the defects of the primary reference and even a combination of Dieck et al and Nodera et al and Liao et al does not result in the present invention.

In contrast to Dieck et al and Nodera et al and Liao et al, the present invention has succeeded to obtain a polycarbonate which is excellent in impact resistance, components rigidity, and chemical resistance, while a superior flame retardancy is maintained even in the case when non-halogen and non-phosphorus compounds are applied to a polycarbonate for improvement of the flame retardancy. See the instant specification, on page 5, lines 13-18.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Dieck et al (EP 105388), the rejection of Claims 1, 6, 7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dieck et al (EP 105388) optionally in view of Nodera et al (EP 692522), the rejection of Claims 1 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Liao et al (US 5,981,661), and the rejection of Claims 1, 6, 7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Liao et al (US 5,981,661) in view of Dieck et al

(EP 105388) are believed to be unsustainable as the present invention is neither anticipated nor obvious and withdrawal of these rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance and early notice of such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Norman F. Oblon
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 24,618

Kirsten A. Grüneberg, Ph.D.
Registration No. 47,297

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
NFO/KAG/lcd